

~~DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL~~  
Before the  
**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION**  
Washington, D.C. 20554

FILED/ACCEPTED  
JUL - 6 2010  
Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

In the Matter of	)	EB Docket No. 07-147
	)	
<b>PENDLETON C. WAUGH, CHARLES M.</b>	)	File No. EB-06-IH-2112
<b>AUSTIN, and JAY R. BISHOP</b>	)	NAL/Acct. No. 200732080025
	)	
<b>PREFERRED COMMUNICATION</b>	)	FRN No. 0003769049
<b>SYSTEMS, INC.</b>	)	
	)	
Licensee of Various Site-by-Site Licenses in	)	
the Specialized Mobile Radio Service.	)	
	)	
<b>PREFERRED ACQUISITIONS, INC.</b>	)	FRN No. 0003786183
	)	
Licensee of Various Economic Area Licenses	)	
in the 800 MHz Specialized Mobile Radio	)	
Service	)	

To: The Commission

**ENFORCEMENT BUREAU'S RESPONSE TO**  
**PETITION TO RELEASE DOCUMENTS**  
**THAT ARE SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER AND**  
**SUPPORTING COMMENTS**

1. On June 23, 2010, Charles Austin, on behalf of himself, Preferred Communications Systems Inc. ("Preferred"), and Preferred Acquisitions Inc. ("PAI") (collectively "Petitioners"), filed a "Petition To Release Documents That Are Subject To Protective Order" ("Petition"). On June 28, 2010, Pendleton C. Waugh filed Comments in Support of the Petition. The Bureau hereby responds to these pleadings.

No. of Copies rec'd 0415  
List A B C D E

2. On November 2, 2007, the Presiding Judge in the above-captioned hearing case adopted a Protective Order (“Protective Order”) governing the use of confidential information in this proceeding.<sup>1</sup> The Protective Order, by its terms, was “intended to facilitate and expedite the review of documents containing trade secrets and commercial or financial information obtained from a person and which is privileged or confidential.”<sup>2</sup> The Protective Order specifically provided that “Confidential Information shall not be used by any person granted access under this Protective Order for any purpose other than for use in this proceeding . . . unless otherwise ordered by the Commission or a court of competent jurisdiction . . . .”<sup>3</sup>

3. Petitioners are defendants in a civil lawsuit in the Court of Chancery of the State of Delaware (“Delaware Court”). They have been directed by the Delaware Court to produce certain documents that are covered by the Protective Order.<sup>4</sup> Petitioners specifically request that the Commission “release, remove or otherwise permit Preferred and Austin to obtain copies” of the non-public portion of Charles Austin’s deposition and related documents, referred to in the Petition as “Protected Documents.”<sup>5</sup> They further request that the Commission permit them to submit these materials to the plaintiffs in the pending court case.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> A copy of the Protective Order as proposed is attached hereto. As noted in the ALJ’s Order adopting such Protective Order, by e-mail, after its proposal but prior to its adoption, the parties to the proceeding agreed to a modification to the proposed Protective Order such that the definition of “Reviewing Party” was amended to mean “an above-captioned person or entity.”

<sup>2</sup> Protective Order at 1.

<sup>3</sup> Protective Order at ¶ 11.

<sup>4</sup> As a part of the Petition, Petitioners attached an Order of the Delaware Court directing Preferred to produce “the entire transcript of Austin’s deposition” including both confidential and public portions and “any and all transcripts relating thereto.” See Petition at Attachment D.

<sup>5</sup> See Petition at 2.

<sup>6</sup> *Id.*

4. The relief requested by Petitioners appears to be unnecessary. The Protective Order, by its own terms, allows for disclosure of materials when a court of competent jurisdiction requires production.<sup>7</sup> Accordingly, assuming that the Delaware Court is a “court of competent jurisdiction” for purposes of the Protective Order, Petitioners may provide material covered by the Protective Order as required by the Delaware Court’s order without Commission action, and without amending the requirements of the Protective Order.

5. Thus, it appears that the Petitioners may produce documents in their possession as directed by the Delaware Court. To the extent that Petitioners did not obtain or maintain copies of certain depositions and supporting materials in the above-captioned proceeding and now seek copies of those materials, they may, in the ordinary course, contact the court reporting company that prepared such documents and purchase them.

6. Accordingly, the Bureau submits that the action requested in the Petition is unnecessary.

Respectfully submitted,


P. Michele Ellison  
Chief, Enforcement Bureau

*asingh*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Anjali K. Singh  
Acting Assistant Chief  
Investigations and Hearings Division

---

<sup>7</sup> See Protective Order at ¶ 11.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Gary A. Oshinsky", is written over a horizontal line.

Gary A. Oshinsky  
Attorney  
Investigations and Hearings Division

Federal Communications Commission  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W., Room 4-C330  
Washington, D.C. 20554  
(202) 418-1420

July 6, 2010

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Rebecca Lockhart, a Paralegal Specialist in the Enforcement Bureau's Investigations and Hearings Division, certifies that she has, on this 6th day of July, 2010, sent by first class United States mail or electronic mail, as noted, copies of the foregoing "Enforcement Bureau's Response to Petition to Release Documents That Are Subject to Protective Order and Supporting Comments," to:

Charles M. Austin  
Preferred Acquisitions, Inc.  
Preferred Communication Systems, Inc.  
400 East Royal Lane, 9 Suite N-24  
Irving, TX 75039  
precomsys@aol.com

Jay R. Bishop  
P.O. Box 5598  
Palm Springs, CA 92262  
jaybishopps@aol.com  
michellebishopps@aol.com

Joel Kaufman\*  
Associate General Counsel  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W., Room 8-A666  
Washington, D.C. 20054

Michael D. Judy  
5874 East Nees  
Clovis, California 93611

Chief Administrative Law Judge Richard L. Sippel\*  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W., Room 1-C768  
Washington, D.C. 20054

William D. Silva\*\*  
Law Offices of William D. Silva  
P.O. Box 1121  
Stevensville, MD 21666  
bill@luselaw.com  
Attorney for Pendleton C. Waugh

  
Rebecca Lockhart

\*Hand-Delivered and Courtesy Copies Sent Via E-Mail and Facsimile

\*\* Service Copies May Be Sent Via E-Mail (E-Mail service acceptable in lieu of hard copies for files 4 MB or less per agreement.)

## ATTACHMENT

Before the  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
Washington, D.C. 20554

FILED/ACCEPTED

AUG 22 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

In the Matter of	)	EB Docket No. 07-147
	)	
PENDLETON C. WAUGH, CHARLES M.	)	File No. EB-06-IH-2112
AUSTIN, and JAY R. BISHOP	)	NAL/Acct. No. 200732080025
	)	
PREFERRED COMMUNICATION	)	FRN No. 0003769049
SYSTEMS, INC.	)	
	)	
Licensee of Various Site-by-Site Licenses in	)	
the Specialized Mobile Radio Service.	)	
	)	
PREFERRED ACQUISITIONS, INC.	)	FRN No. 0003786183
	)	
Licensee of Various Economic Area Licenses	)	
in the 800 MHz Specialized Mobile Radio	)	
Service	)	

To: The Honorable Judge Arthur I. Steinberg

**ENFORCEMENT BUREAU'S MOTION**  
**FOR ADOPTION OF MODEL PROTECTIVE ORDER**

1. The Enforcement Bureau ("Bureau"), pursuant to Sections 1.45 and 1.313 of the Commission's Rules, 47 C.F.R. §§ 1.45 and 1.313, hereby requests the Presiding Administrative Law Judge to adopt a Model Protective Order ("MPO"), appended hereto as Attachment A. In support whereof, the following is shown.

2. On June 30, 2006, the Bureau issued a letter of inquiry to Preferred Communication Systems, Inc. ("PCSI") in the above-captioned proceeding. In a response dated July 27, 2006, PCSI submitted certain documents (exhibits marked with Bates Stamp numbers PCSI00001 to PCSI02214) for which it requested confidential treatment. On December 27, 2006, the Bureau issued a second letter of inquiry to PCSI.

In a response dated January 25, 2007, PCSI submitted additional documents, a portion of which it requested be afforded confidential treatment (a privilege log and exhibits marked with Bates Stamp number 001113 to 001176). The respective confidentiality requests remain pending.<sup>1</sup>

3. On July 20, 2007, the Commission released *Pendleton C. Waugh, et al.*, Order to Show Cause and Notice of Opportunity for Hearing, FCC 07-125 (July 20, 2007) (“OSC”). The OSC designated the above-captioned proceeding for hearing.

4. On July 26, 2007, in *Pendleton C. Waugh, et al.*, Order, FCC 07M-26, the Chief Administrative Law Judge assigned this proceeding to the Presiding Administrative Law Judge, and scheduled a prehearing conference for September 12, 2007. In preparation for hearing, the Bureau anticipates propounding discovery requests on documents for which PCSI has pending confidentiality requests. As such discovery requests may both concern documents for which PCSI has requested confidential treatment and may yield documents for which PCSI or other parties will seek confidential treatment, EB seeks adoption of the MPO appended hereto, previously approved for use by the Commission.

5. *In the Matter of Examination of Current Policy Concerning the Treatment of Confidential Information Submitted to the Commission*, Report and Order, 13 FCC Rcd. 24816, the Commission adopted use of an MPO attached as Exhibit C to its Report and Order, noting that:

Protective orders can provide the benefit of protecting competitively valuable information while permitting limited disclosure for a specific public purpose . . . we conclude that the benefits of adopting an MPO for

---

<sup>1</sup> Neither referring to these documents in this pleading, nor treating them as confidential while the request to treat them confidentially is pending, constitutes any ruling on the merits of the request that those documents be treated confidentially. As noted, *infra*, the requests for confidentiality remain pending.



general use in Commission proceedings will be substantial. It will reduce the need for lengthy negotiations or litigation over the terms of such orders and help prevent delays in proceedings.<sup>2</sup>

The Commission also stated that it believed “the MPO will prove appropriate in most instances where protective orders are appropriate,”<sup>3</sup> but that “the Bureaus will retain the authority to use a different or modified protective order where they determine it is warranted.”<sup>4</sup> Particularly relevant to the instant proceeding, the Commission noted that “[t]he MPO may also be used to provide limited access to information on a timely basis where the submitter has made a good faith request for confidential treatment of information pursuant to Section 0.459(a) and the Commission has not yet ruled on the request.”<sup>5</sup>

6. Since its adoption, the MPO has been approved for use in Commission proceedings.<sup>6</sup> In a similar vein, the Presiding Administrative Law Judge has previously approved the use of a confidentiality agreement in a hearing proceeding.<sup>7</sup> Here, where PCSI’s confidentiality requests are still pending, the Bureau respectfully submits that adoption of the attached MPO would facilitate free exchange of documents submitted for confidential treatment among the parties to the hearing that sign the Declaration appended to the MPO, while preserving the confidential treatment requested in good faith by PCSI.

---

<sup>2</sup> See *Examination of Current Policy Concerning the Treatment of Confidential Information Submitted to the Commission*, Report and Order, 13 FCC Rcd. 24816, 24831-24832 (1998).

<sup>3</sup> See *id.* at 24832.

<sup>4</sup> *Id.*

<sup>5</sup> *Id.*

<sup>6</sup> See, e.g., *Applications for the Transfer of Control of Licenses and Authorizations from Nextel Communications, Inc. and its Subsidiaries to Sprint Corporation*, 20 FCC Rcd. 3607 (WTB 2005) (adopting a protective order based on the MPO).

<sup>7</sup> See *Arkansas Cable Telecommunications Association, et al.*, Order, FCC 06M-39 (ALJ Steinberg, Dec. 15, 2006) (granting motion for adoption of a protective order and approving stipulated confidentiality agreement).

7. For the foregoing reasons, the Bureau respectfully requests that the Presiding Administrative Law Judge adopt the attached MPO.

Respectfully submitted,  
Kris Anne Monteith  
Chief, Enforcement Bureau

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Gary A. Oshinsky", written over a horizontal line.

Gary A. Oshinsky  
Attorney, Investigations and Hearings Division

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Anjali K. Singh", written below the signature of Gary A. Oshinsky.

Anjali K. Singh  
Attorney, Investigations and Hearings Division

Federal Communications Commission  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W., Room 4-C330  
Washington, D.C. 20554  
(202) 418-1420

August 22, 2007

**ATTACHMENT A**

Before the  
**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION**  
Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of	)	EB Docket No. 07-147
	)	
PENDLETON C. WAUGH, CHARLES M.	)	File No. EB-06-IH-2112
AUSTIN, and JAY R. BISHOP	)	NAL/Acct. No. 200732080025
	)	
PREFERRED COMMUNICATION	)	FRN No. 0003769049
SYSTEMS, INC.	)	
	)	
Licensee of Various Site-by-Site Licenses in	)	
the Specialized Mobile Radio Service.	)	
	)	
PREFERRED ACQUISITIONS, INC.	)	FRN No. 0003786183
	)	
Licensee of Various Economic Area Licenses	)	
in the 800 MHz Specialized Mobile Radio	)	
Service	)	

**PROTECTIVE ORDER**

This Protective Order is intended to facilitate and expedite the review of documents containing trade secrets and commercial or financial information obtained from a person and which is privileged or confidential. It reflects the manner in which "Confidential Information," as that term is defined herein, is to be treated. The Order is not intended to constitute a resolution of the merits concerning whether any Confidential Information would be released publicly by the Commission upon a proper request under the Freedom of Information Act or other applicable law or regulation, including 47 C.F.R. § 0.442.

**1. Definitions.**

- a. Authorized Representative. "Authorized Representative" shall have the meaning set forth in Paragraph seven.
- b. Commission. "Commission" means the Federal Communications Commission or any arm of the Commission acting pursuant to delegated authority.
- c. Confidential Information. "Confidential Information" means (i) information submitted to the Commission by the Submitting Party that has been so designated by the Submitting Party and which the Submitting Party has determined in good faith constitutes trade secrets or commercial or financial information which is privileged or confidential within the meaning of Exemption 4 of the Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. § 552(b)(4); (ii) information submitted to the Commission by the Submitting Party that has been so designated by the Submitting Party and which the Submitting Party has determined in good faith falls within the terms of Commission orders

designating the items for treatment as Confidential Information; and (iii) information that the Commission has allowed to be examined off-site and that otherwise complies with the requirements of this paragraph. Confidential Information includes additional copies of and information derived from Confidential Information.

d. Declaration. "Declaration" means Attachment A to this Protective Order.

e. Reviewing Party. "Reviewing Party" means a person or entity participating in this proceeding or considering in good faith filing a document in this proceeding.

f. Submitting Party. "Submitting Party" means a person or entity that seeks confidential treatment of Confidential Information pursuant to this Protective Order.

2. Claim of Confidentiality. The Submitting Party, may designate information as "Confidential Information" consistent with the definition of that term in Paragraph 1 of this Protective Order. The Commission may, *sua sponte* or upon petition, pursuant to 47 C.F.R. § § 0.459 & 0.461, determine that all or part of the information claimed as "Confidential Information" is not entitled to such treatment.

3. Procedures for Claiming Information is Confidential. Confidential Information submitted to the Commission shall be filed under seal and shall bear on the front page in bold print, "CONTAINS PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION - DO NOT RELEASE." Confidential Information shall be segregated by the Submitting Party from all non-confidential information submitted to the Commission. To the extent a document contains both Confidential Information and non-confidential information, the Submitting Party shall designate the specific portions of the document claimed to contain Confidential Information and shall, where feasible, also submit a redacted version not containing Confidential Information.

4. Storage of Confidential Information at the Commission. The Secretary of the Commission or other Commission staff to whom Confidential Information is submitted shall place the Confidential Information in a non-public file. Confidential Information shall be segregated in the files of the Commission, and shall be withheld from inspection by any person not bound by the terms of this Protective Order, unless such Confidential Information is released from the restrictions of this Order either through agreement of the parties, or pursuant to the order of the Commission or a court having jurisdiction.

5. Access to Confidential Information. Confidential Information shall only be made available to Commission staff, Commission consultants and to counsel to the Reviewing Parties, or if a Reviewing Party has no counsel, to a person designated by the Reviewing Party. Before counsel to a Reviewing Party or such other designated person designated by the Reviewing Party may obtain access to Confidential Information, counsel or such other designated person must execute the attached Declaration. Consultants under contract to the Commission may obtain access to Confidential Information only if they have signed, as part of their employment contract, a non-disclosure agreement or if they execute the attached Declaration.

6. Counsel to a Reviewing Party or such other person designated pursuant to Paragraph 5 may disclose Confidential Information to other Authorized Representatives to whom

disclosure is permitted under the terms of paragraph 7 of this Protective Order only after advising such Authorized Representatives of the terms and obligations of the Order. In addition, before Authorized Representatives may obtain access to Confidential Information, each Authorized Representative must execute the attached Declaration.

7. Authorized Representatives shall be limited to:

- a. Counsel for the Reviewing Parties to this proceeding, including in-house counsel actively engaged in the conduct of this proceeding, and their associated attorneys, paralegals, clerical staff and other employees, to the extent reasonably necessary to render professional services in this proceeding;
- b. Specified persons, including employees of the Reviewing Parties, requested by counsel to furnish technical or other expert advice or service, or otherwise engaged to prepare material for the express purpose of formulating filings in this proceeding; or
- c. Any person designated by the Commission in the public interest, upon such terms as the Commission may deem proper.

8. Inspection of Confidential Information. Confidential Information shall be maintained by a Submitting Party for inspection at two or more locations, at least one of which shall be in Washington, D.C. Inspection shall be carried out by Authorized Representatives upon reasonable notice (generally not to exceed one business day) during normal business hours.

9. Copies of Confidential Information. The Submitting Party shall provide a copy of the Confidential Material to Authorized Representatives upon request and may charge a reasonable copying fee not to exceed twenty five cents per page. Authorized Representatives may make additional copies of Confidential Information but only to the extent required and solely for the preparation and use in this proceeding, Authorized Representatives must maintain a written record of any additional copies made and provide this record to the Submitting Party upon reasonable request. The original copy and all other copies of the Confidential Information shall remain in the care and control of Authorized Representatives at all times. Authorized Representatives having custody of any Confidential Information shall keep the documents properly secured at all times.

10. Filing of Declaration. Counsel for Reviewing Parties shall provide to the Submitting Party and the Commission with a copy of the attached Declaration for each Authorized Representative within five (5) business days after the attached Declaration is executed, or by any other deadline that may be prescribed by the Commission.

11. Use of Confidential Information. Confidential Information shall not be used by any person granted access under this Protective Order for any purpose other than for use in this proceeding (including any subsequent administrative or judicial review) unless otherwise ordered by the Commission or a court of competent jurisdiction, shall not be used for competitive business purposes, and shall not be used or disclosed except in accordance with this Order. This shall not preclude the use of any material or information that is in the public domain or has been developed independently by any other person who has not had access to the Confidential Information nor otherwise

learned of its contents.

12. Pleadings Using Confidential Information. Submitting Parties and Reviewing Parties may, in any pleadings that they file in this proceeding, reference the Confidential Information, but only if they comply with the following procedures:

- a. Any portions of the pleadings that contain or disclose Confidential Information must be physically segregated from the remainder of the pleadings and filed under seal;
- b. The portions containing or disclosing Confidential Information must be covered by a separate letter referencing this Protective Order;
- c. Each page of any Party's filing that contains or discloses Confidential Information subject to this Order must be clearly marked:  
"Confidential Information included pursuant to Protective Order, [cite proceeding];" and
- d. The confidential portion(s) of the pleading, to the extent they are required to be served, shall be served upon the Secretary of the Commission, the Submitting Party, and those Reviewing Parties that have signed the attached Declaration. Such confidential portions shall be served under seal. They shall not be placed in the Commission's Public File unless the Commission directs otherwise (with notice to the Submitting Party and an opportunity to comment on such proposed disclosure). A Submitting Party or a Reviewing Party filing a pleading containing Confidential Information shall also file a redacted copy of the pleading containing no Confidential Information, which copy shall be placed in the Commission's public files. A Submitting Party or a Reviewing Party may provide courtesy copies of pleadings containing Confidential Information to Commission staff so long as the notation required by subsection c. of this paragraph is not removed.

13. Violations of Protective Order. Should a Reviewing Party that has properly obtained access to Confidential Information under this Protective Order violate any of its terms, it shall immediately convey that fact to the Commission and to the Submitting Party. Further, should such violation consist of improper disclosure or use of Confidential Information, the violating party shall take all necessary steps to remedy the improper disclosure or use. The Violating Party shall also immediately notify the Commission and the Submitting Party, in writing, of the identity of each party known or reasonably suspected to have obtained the Confidential Information through any such disclosure. The Commission retains its full authority to fashion appropriate sanctions for violations of this Protective Order, including but not limited to suspension or disbarment of attorneys from practice before the Commission, forfeitures, cease and desist orders, and denial of further access to Confidential Information in this or any other Commission proceeding. Nothing in this Protective Order shall limit any other rights and remedies available to the Submitting Party at law or equity against any party using Confidential Information in a manner not authorized by this Protective Order.

14. Termination of Proceeding. Unless otherwise ordered by the Commission or a court of competent jurisdiction, within two weeks after final resolution of this proceeding (which includes any administrative or judicial appeals), Authorized Representatives of

Reviewing Parties shall destroy or return to the Submitting Party all Confidential Information as well as all copies and derivative materials made. Authorized representatives shall certify in a writing served on the Commission and the Submitting Party that no material whatsoever derived from such Confidential Information has been retained by any person having access thereto, except that counsel to a Reviewing Party may retain two copies of pleadings submitted on behalf of the Reviewing Party and other attorney work product. Any confidential information contained in any copies of pleadings retained by counsel to a Reviewing Party or in materials that have been destroyed pursuant to this paragraph shall be protected from disclosure or use indefinitely in accordance with paragraphs 9 and 11 of this Protective Order unless such Confidential Information is released from the restrictions of this Order either through agreement of the parties, or pursuant to the order of the Commission or a court having jurisdiction.

15. No Waiver of Confidentiality. Disclosure of Confidential Information as provided herein shall not be deemed a waiver by the Submitting Party of any privilege or entitlement to confidential treatment of such Confidential Information. Reviewing Parties, by viewing these materials: (a) agree not to assert any such waiver; (b) agree not to use information derived from any confidential materials to seek disclosure in any other proceeding; and (c) agree that accidental disclosure of Confidential Information shall not be deemed a waiver of any privilege.

16. Additional Rights Preserved. The entry of this Protective Order is without prejudice to the rights of the Submitting Party to apply for additional or different protection where it is deemed necessary or to the rights of Reviewing Parties to request further or renewed disclosure of Confidential Information.

17. Effect of Protective Order. This Protective Order constitutes an Order of the Commission and an agreement between the Reviewing Party, executing the attached Declaration, and the Submitting Party.

18. Authority. This Protective Order is issued pursuant to Sections 4(i) and 4(j) of the Communications Act as amended, 47 U.S.C. § § 154(i), and (j) and 47 C.F.R. § 0.457(d).

Attachment to Protective Order

Before the  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of	)	EB Docket No. 07-147
	)	
PENDLETON C. WAUGH, CHARLES M.	)	File No. EB-06-IH-2112
AUSTIN, and JAY R. BISHOP	)	NAL/Acct. No. 200732080025
	)	
PREFERRED COMMUNICATION	)	FRN No. 0003769049
SYSTEMS, INC.	)	
	)	
Licensee of Various Site-by-Site Licenses in	)	
the Specialized Mobile Radio Service.	)	
	)	
PREFERRED ACQUISITIONS, INC.	)	FRN No. 0003786183
	)	
Licensee of Various Economic Area Licenses	)	
in the 800 MHz Specialized Mobile Radio	)	
Service	)	

**DECLARATION**

I, \_\_\_\_\_, hereby declare under penalty of perjury that I have read the Protective Order in this proceeding, and that I agree to be bound by its terms pertaining to the treatment of Confidential Information submitted by parties to this proceeding. I understand that the Confidential Information shall not be disclosed to anyone except in accordance with the terms of the Protective Order and shall be used only for purposes of the proceedings in this matter. I acknowledge that a violation of the Protective Order is a violation of an order of the Federal Communications Commission. I acknowledge that this Protective Order is also a binding agreement with the Submitting Party.

(signed) \_\_\_\_\_  
(printed name) \_\_\_\_\_  
(representing) \_\_\_\_\_  
(title) \_\_\_\_\_  
(employer) \_\_\_\_\_  
(address) \_\_\_\_\_  
(phone) \_\_\_\_\_  
(date) \_\_\_\_\_



**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

Karen Richardson, an Enforcement Analyst in the Enforcement Bureau's Investigations and Hearings Division, certifies that she has, on this 22nd day of August, 2007, sent by first class United States mail copies of the foregoing "Enforcement Bureau's Motion for Adoption of Model Protective Order" to:

Charles M. Austin  
c/o Preferred Communications Systems, Inc.  
6311 North O'Connor Boulevard N24  
Irving, Texas 75039

Preferred Communication Systems, Inc.  
6311 North O'Connor Boulevard N24  
Irving, Texas 75039

Charles J. Ryan, III  
Attorney At Law  
12502 Trelawn Ter.  
Mitchellville MD 20721

Preferred Acquisitions, Inc.  
c/o Preferred Communications Systems, Inc.  
6311 North O'Connor Boulevard N24  
Irving, Texas 75039

Pendleton C. Waugh  
9150 E Del Camino  
Suite 114  
Scottsdale, Arizona 85258

Jay R. Bishop  
c/o Preferred Communications Systems, Inc.  
6311 North O'Connor Boulevard N24  
Irving, Texas 75039

Jay R. Bishop  
c/o Michelle Bishop  
3520 N. Weston Pl.  
Long Beach, CA 90807

Jay R. Bishop

c/o Michelle Bishop  
1190 South Farrell Drive  
Palm Springs, CA 92264

Charles J. Ryan, III  
Attorney At Law  
Post Office Box 4782  
Upper Marlboro, Maryland, 20775

Administrative Law Judge Arthur I. Steinberg\*  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W., Room 1-C861  
Washington, D.C. 20054

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Karen Richardson

\* Hand-Delivered